



10-C4700 DAC
#10

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of inventor Freire

Serial No. 09/950,047 Group Art Unit: NA
Filed: 09/12/2001 Examiner: NA

For: "**STRUCTURAL PREDICTION OF ALLOSTERICISM**"

Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, D.C. 20231

**RENEWED PETITION IN RESPONSE TO DECISION DISMISSING PETITION
UNDER 37 C.F.R.1.53**

Dear Sir:

Further to the Renewed Petition filed in this case on July 25, 2002, and pursuant to the Decision Dismissing Petition mailed on August 8, 2002, Applicant herewith encloses a copy of page 17 identical with the page 17 originally filed for the above-referenced United States patent application. Please associate this page with the application.

No fee is submitted herewith since renewed petition is free. However, should any fees be required, please charge attorney's account 50-2041 (Whitham, Curtis & Whitham).

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth E. Tyler-Cross

Reg. No. 45,922

703-787-9400



30743
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


RECEIVED

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

AUG 16 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Paper No. 7



WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, PC
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

COPY MAILED

AUG 08 2002

In re Application of :
Freire :
Application No. 09/950,047 :
Filed: September 12, 2001 :
Attorney Docket No. 1539(03940014AA) :

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

DECISION DISMISSING
PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed July 25, 2002, to establish that page 17 of the specification was part of the originally filed application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.53 is **dismissed**.

On September 12, 2001, the application was filed.

On October 18, 2001, the Office of Initial Patent Examination mailed a "Notice of Omitted Item(s)" stating that the application had been accorded a filing date of September 12, 2001, and advising applicants that page 17 appeared to have been omitted.

In response, on March 20, 2002, a petition was filed alleging that page 17 was deposited on September 12, 2001. The evidence was convincing that the application papers deposited on September 12, 2001, included page 17, and that page 17 was subsequently misplaced in the PTO. Unfortunately, although the papers filed on March 20, 2002, stated they were accompanied by a copy of page 17, a copy of page 17 could not be found in the file. Therefore, the petition was dismissed since examination of the application could not satisfactorily be performed without a copy of page 17.


The decision mailed July 17, 2002, stated, "Petitioner should submit another copy of page 17 along with a renewed petition within two months."

In response a copy of page 17 was sent by facsimile transmission to the Office. Unfortunately, facsimile transmission introduces changes which alter page 17 from the original page submitted. For example, a header is added to the page, the font size changes, the clarity of the print changes, and the margins change. Therefore, the Office asks that petitioner mail or hand deliver a copy of page 17 identical with the page 17 originally filed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Commissioner for Patents
Box DAC
Washington, D.C. 20231

By hand: Office of Petitions
2201 South Clark Place
Crystal Plaza 4, Suite 3C23
Arlington, VA 22202



Telephone inquiries should be directed to Petitions Attorney Steven Brantley at (703) 306-5683.


Charles Steven Brantley
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy